DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 425 TM 012 426

AUTHOR Ligon, Glynn; Jackson, Elaine E.
TITLE The Policy-Practice LOOP in Practice.
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO AISD-87.28
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Uses in Education; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Utilization; Instructional Improvement; *Online Systems; Organizational Objectives; *Policy Formation; Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS Austin Independent School District TX; *Linking Outcomes to Organizational Planning; Status Reports

ABSTRACT

The Linking Outcomes with Organizational Planning (LOOP) process, initiated in 1984 in the Austin (Texas) Independent School District (AISD) is described. Focus is on the successful conversion to on-line computer updates and the development of a training package for key staff on writing status reports. LOOP is a nine-step process for integrating research, evaluation, and less formal findings into the planning and instructional cycle. The nine steps are: (1) identifying findings for improving instruction; (2) establishing a goal for improvement; (3) assigning a key staff member to manage progress; (4) having the key staff member work with others as appropriate; (5) providing outcomes and activities; (6) updating computer files with progress reports; (7) providing printed updates and continuous information; (8) monitoring of each goal by the Superintendent and staff; and (9) providing data for the District, community, and state. The use of the on-line computer system has greatly simplified the LOOP process. The program is considered a qualified success; it is most useful to the superintendent, and least attractive to the staff. Attachments include memoranda on 1986-87 priorities for AISD and a sample LOOP procedure for improving student performance in elementary mathematics on the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300425

The Policy-Practice-Policy LOOP in Practice

Glynn Ligon
Elaine E. Jackson
Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Holly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, Louisiana April, 1988

Publication Number 87.28

TM012 426

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Policy-Practice-Policy LOOP in Practice

The challenge for everyone in public school evaluation is how to effect follow-up on evaluation findings of importance. Evaluation utilization is an art, not a science. The Austin Independent School District (AISD) had tried several very formal approaches that required instructional/program staff to write plans and provide status reports on action taken pursuant to evaluation findings. However, our success was minimal, at best. In the summer of 1984, the Superintendent of Schools asked for another attempt—but one that would work. He wanted a sure-fire procedure for making evaluation findings a part of what he termed the instructional planning loop, and a way to monitor staff activities in priority areas. The result was LOOP— Linking Outcomes with Organizational Planning -- a more practical approach built on the ruins of our previous attempts.

As further impetus for LOOP, the Board of Trustees set 25 priorities for the 1984-85 school year, and the Superintendent needed a system for tracking progress on the priorities. New priorities were selected for 1985-86 and 1986-87, and the system proposed as LOOP was used to track activities throughout each of these school years, and to produce a complete report at the end of each year on the status of the District in each of the priority areas. The main purposes were initially seen as being:

1. **To ensure that evaluation, research, and less formal findings become part of the instructional planning loop within AISD.**

2. **To provide the Superintendent a tool to manage the high-priority tasks of the school system, to keep staff focused on goals, and to track accomplishments throughout the year.**

3. **To provide a format for reporting to the Superintendent, the School Board, and the public about progress on major activities.**

An AERA paper presented in 1986 in San Francisco detailed the progress of the system through its less than perfect beginnings. Now, it is time to report the maturation of LOOP—the successful conversion to on-line computer updates and the development of a training package for key staff on writing status updates.

LOOP is a nine-step process for integrating research, evaluation, and less formal findings into the planning and instructional cycle. The nine steps of LOOP are:

1. A finding with implications for improving instruction is identified.

2. A goal or intended outcome is established for improvement.

3. A key staff member is assigned the responsibility of managing progress toward the goal.

4. The key staff member works with other appropriate staff, advisory groups, and community groups to identify activities related to the goal.

5. The key staff member provides for the LOOP process the expected outcomes and the activities related to the outcomes, using the District's Wang Word Processing system.

6. The key staff member updates the appropriate computer file at designated times, providing progress reports on activities and status of the expected outcomes.

7. The Department of Management Information provides printed updates to the Superintendent, and computer updates are continuously available.

8. The Superintendent and Cabinet monitor progress toward each goal, and at the time of the annual report decide to continue or discontinue close monitoring of each goal.

9. The printed report on the goals provides data for the District, the community, and for State-mandated reports of the District's status.

In the first year, 1984-85, the LOOP system used to document progress on District priorities was labor intensive. One evaluation associate was responsible for collecting written input on a monthly basis. She sent out reminders before the reports were supposed to be sent to her, then telephoned the key staff person if the report was late. She not infrequently ended up writing down information from a telephone conversation or personal interview if the staff person "did not have time" to write something down. Then a secretary spent a week each month updating and entering information into the word processing system. Senior evaluation staff then reviewed the document before it was reproduced and distributed. All this in addition to the reporting efforts of many key staff members.

For 1985-86, the process was greatly simplified by the use of the on-line Wang system. The majority of the key staff members were able to access the report document directly, so status reporting could be part of each activity, rather than a completely separate project. The "LOOP secretary" then needed only to enter text from staff who were not on-line and make corrections in the format before the document was printed. Professional staff then reviewed the document before it was finally printed and distributed.

At the end of year two, the priority status report was used for the first time as the basis for theSuperintendent's annual report to the Board and the public on the status of the District. It was also included in a State-mandated report to the public on the District as a whole.

The first two years of LOOP showed that key staff did not have innate ability to write status reports. Before year three, training was designed to teach staff to use action verbs to describe planned activities and outcomes, how to cite statistics to drive home points, how to give themselves credit for

their efforts/successes, and how to write in terms of products rather than merely processes. Staff previously trained in the laborious and superfluous seven elements of behavioral objectives had to be retrained to be concise and targeted in their prose.

For year three, the key staff members bought into the process by attending the training themselves and by sending their secretaries to be trained on using the on-line system and maintaining the format (Attachment A). Even those staff at remote locations sent their secretaries to other offices to access the on-line system, so that no entering of data was done centrally. The format was checked and the printed document was distributed as the staff members wrote it. The Superintendant not only officially appointed the staff to report on the priorities, he also monitored and reacted to their reports (Attachment B). The final document showed more variation in writing style, but it also more accurately reflected the commitment of the staff member to the process.

The training which led the key staff members to treat the LOOP process itself as a priority led to higher quality reporting in the third year (a sample is shown as Attachment C), and when the need arose within the District to report to the Board and the public on student reassignment issues and activities, the LOOP format was chosen by the staff themselves as the vehicle for this crucial recordkeeping. The reports produced after the second and third years have been used in the Superintendent's evaluation by the Board and as part of the District's State-mandated report to the community and the media. Staff are obviously more familiar with the technology involved in the system, and are, if not comfortable, at least used to the idea of being formally accountable for the achievement of District goals.

For the current year, 1987-88, key staff were assigned priorities, the on-line system training was conducted for secretaries, and the process continues. It is not universally loved, but staff have become used to it.

Now the Superintendent wants to tie the LOOP reporting cycle on priorities to the budget cycle. In this process the District's status on its formal priorities will be reported to the Board along with budget considerations during the four to six month budget planning period. When the budget is adopted in July of each year, the Board will also adopt new goals and priorities for the coming year. Within this framework, staff will perceive the importance of their reporting in the area where it will have the most impact — in their budgets (The cycle diagram is shown as Attachment D).

The conditions which were necessary to make LOOP a success were:

A clear and specific mandate from the Superintendent.

Designation of a key person to track and report in each area.

Integration of LOOP into established procedures.

Specific check points and follow-up procedures.

Findings requiring action from diverse sources districtwide.

In critically reviewing our successes and failures with LOOP over the past years, several core truths appear to be evident. These truths should be as useful to others adapting LOOP to their local circumstances as they have been to us.

1. The Board of Trustees sets too many priorities. This problem begins with staff. Selecting a choice few priorities from a long list of critical needs is difficult — especially when the Superintendent's Cabinet represents a broad range of interests and responsibilities. Obviously, the members of the Board also represent a broad range of constituents who look for their pet projects to be covered by priorities. However, clearly, we have had too many priorities each year to track in detail. The LOOP system does take time, and was designed to focus on a few, not all, needs of the District.

2. Key staff list too many activities. Either staff members are not very good at deciding what is really important to track in LOOP, or we have not yet communicated effectively that LOOP is not their detailed yearly work plan, but an overview of a priority. A frustrating problem is that the status reports get too lengthy. Activities are listed that are important, but not essential, to communicating the processes by which the priority is being addressed.

3. The one-year nature of the priorities fails to recognize that the needs of the District can not in most cases be resolved in a short time, but persist across years. Most of the priorities that have been included each year in LOOP are the same ones. We are beginning to recognize that there are some generic priorities that will always be included — facilities, budget, management information, student achievement, dropouts, public relations in some form, etc. Eventually, we may have a subset of "permanent" priorities that are refocused each year.

4. The timing of setting priorities has been problematic, as they have been approved by the Board at the beginning of the school year, but too late to be a real part of the schools' planning and preparation for the new year. Now that our priority setting cycle has been redefined to match the budgeting timeline, everyone will have the priorities available at the time planning begins for the school year — the previous spring.

5. The training of key staff members to write their priority goals, activities, and status reports becomes more important each year. Staff do not naturally write in the style that is required for a concise, informative status report.

6. The on-line nature of the current reporting is basic to the ownership of the status reports by the key staff. The first year, when an evaluation staff member compiled the status reports, there was so little ownership in the report that key staff let other responsibilities prevent them from focusing the required attention on their priority reporting.

7. There must be periodic monitoring and comment by the Superintendent on the status of the priorities. Asking key staff to concentrate on a professional report just at the end of the year backlogs their thinking and writing to a point where they are hard pressed to comply. The periodic review of the status reports by the Superintendent keeps staff more up-to-date in their reporting and spreads their efforts out across the year.

Conclusion

LOOP has been a qualified success. Any process that continues in a school system for four years has to have some degree of functionality or it would have been abandoned. LOOP appears to be most useful to the Superintendent — not surprising, considering that he was the one who requested it. However, the members of the Board of Trustees have grown to expect priorities to be set and reports to be brought forward on their status. Staff members will probably be the last to buy into the process. After all, LOOP is a report — paperwork — for them. This fact leads us to consider the need to create a better, more functional link between LOOP and the daily management of the school system. Is it possible to design a management system that would function for a dozen or so very unique individuals?

Yes, but would they use it?

Austin Independent School District
Dr. John Ellis, Superintendent

November 4, 1986

TO: Ruth MacAllister

FROM: John Ellis

SUBJECT: 1986-87 Priorities for AISD

The Board of Trustees on October 27, 1986, approved the 1986-87 Priorities for AISD. The designation of priorities for the year gives District staff a common focus around which to plan activities and a way to judge progress toward our goals.

I have designated you as the key staff person for one or more priorities and asked that the Department of Management Information manage the computer files and print out status reports on a regular basis. The priorities I am assigning to you are:

Priority II. Curriculum/Instructional Program

A. To improve student performance, especially TEAMS mathematics
B. To reduce the failure rate of students, especially in grades 7-9
C. To reduce the number of students dropping out of school
D. To emphasize the prevention of drug abuse
E. To begin a study of the elementary social studies and science curriculum with the goal of more interesting and teachable units

Your responsibility as a key staff person for one or more priority sections will be similar to last year, although there will be some modifications to the system. This year you will:

1. Attend a training session on November 17, 1986, in the auditorium, where Glynn Ligon and Jetta Todaro will work with you on defining the expected results and processes planned for your priorities.

2. Bring your secretary to the same training session to hear the introduction. Then she will attend a workshop on updating the Wang files.

6100 Guadalupe Austin, Texas 78752-4495 512/451-8411

The initial report will be printed on Thursday, December 4, and the schedule or the rest of the year is:

Quarterly Report:	January 15, 1987
Quarterly Report:	April 9, 1987
End-of-Year Report:	June 11, 1987
Summary of Year:	August 13, 1987 (Prepared by Management Information from the end-of-year report)

This priority-tracking process is valuable to me, to the Cabinet, and, I believe, to you. As we focus on our priorities, plan immediate objectives, and report our successes and failures, we are about the basic business of improving our District, our students, and our own skills.

Austin Independent School District

Dr. John Ellis, Superintendent

February 9, 1987

TO: LaVonne Rogers

FROM: John Ellis

SUBJECT: 1986-87 Priorities

Welcome to a new perspective on the 1986-87 District Priorities! You, of course, will now be the key staff person for those sections that refer to Elementary Education. Please, review these with your staff to see the direction that Elementary Education is heading this year. This document and the outlined information it contains are important to me in keeping abreast of the progress of our staff toward meeting the goals we have set for ourselves this year. I hope the process will also be helpful to you in orienting you in your new role.

I have been reviewing the status reports on the 1986-87 priorities and am impressed with the thought and planning evident in them. The recent budget analyses and Board study session attracted a major portion of our energies; therefore, we now need to refocus on the activities and the target dates established for the priorities. This is after all, the place where you can claim credit for the hard work you do.

We are half way through this school year now, and I would like to meet individually with each key staff person on the progress of the priorities. At that time, you can advise me on how the balance of the year will go in completing the planned activities in an expeditious manner. As you update your status report for that session, keep in mind our focus on emphasizing results more than activities. Review the "Anticipated Results" section to sharpen these statements to be measurable and targeted on the centrality of the issues underlying each priority.

Please consider the following observations in regard to the priorities for which you are the key staff person.

II. A. <u>To Improve Student Performance, Especially TEAMS Mathematics</u>

Now that we have the latest Exit-Level results indicating good news, I am sure all eyes are focused upon this month's TEAMS testing. Although the results will come later, I am particularly interested in seeing the priority report reflect the processes we implemented this year to prepare the students. The next status report should be much more complete than the current one in this area.

LaVonne Rogers
February 9, 1987

II. B. To Reduce the Failure Rate of Students, Particularly Grades 7-9

We have been hearing reports that the failure rate has declined this year in contrast to past years; however, the status report does not reflect this good news. Let's not wait until the end of the year to begin reporting the results when we have numbers already available.

II. C. To Reduce the Number of Students Dropping Out of School

The new policy and the positive reactions to it are very encouraging. This is a priority that deserves our special attention in the status report because many audiences will want to have updates on our progress.

II. D. To Emphasize the Prevention of Drug Abuse

The status section for this priority is one of the most complete. Please, continue to reflect the ongoing activities, especially campus-level acccmplishments.

II. E. To Begin a Study of the Elementary Social Studies and Science Curriculum with the Goal to Identify Ways to Make Units More Interesting, Teachable

The activities outlined and the progress to date show that we have a good beginning on this priority. The result that is described is currently very broad and needs to be tied down to a more precise product. I envision having a formal report that concisely describes the recommendations of your group and ensures that they are reflected in the 1987-88 budget, scheduled staff development activities, and future curriculum revisions.

Betty Lawson has cleared my calendar for a block of time to meet with key staff about these priorities. She will be contacting you to confirm the date and time.

Priority II. CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

A. To Improve Student Performance, Especially TEAMS Mathematics (Elementary)

CONTEXT:

AISD students have a proud record of academic success on a number of standardized tests. On both the ITBS for grades 1 through 8 and the TAP for grades 9 through 12, AISD students outperform national averages. The district also boasts high performance on the SAT and in the National Merit Scholarship Program. On all these measures, AISD students outperform national averages.

However, on the TEAMS, given in grades 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11, the record is not so satisfying. Particularly in mathematics, AISD falls below expectations when it should be number one.

1985-86 ITBS and TAP national percentile composite averages for AISD students were:

	ITBS								TAP			
Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Spring, 1986 Median	65	61	63	57	58	56	60	64	55	65	64	61

1986 SAT averages for AISD seniors were:

	V	M
AISD	444	489
TEXAS	419	458
NATIONAL	431	475

1985-86 TEAMS mastery percentages and ranks for AISD among the eight urban districts in Texas were:

Grades	1	3	5	7	9	11
% Mastering Reading/ Language Arts	73	73	82	77	79	94
AISD Rank	2	2	3	1	3	1
% Mastering Mathematics	82	77	75	74	77	92
AISD Rank	3	3	3	6	4	1
% Mastering Writing	80	61	61	64	59	--
AISD Rank	2	2	2	3	3	

Priority II.A (continued)Elementary

RESULTS:

Anticipated	Achieved
ELEMENTARY	
1. Principals will be provided with basic information about the 1985-86 TEAMS scores and a planning guide for improvement of students' mastery of TEAMS objectives, especially in mathematics.	All elementary principals received inservice which included strategies to improve students' achievement on the TEAMS. A planning guide was distributed August 1986.
2. Campuses will write individual campus student achievement goals and describe related teaching activities which are intended to improve students' performance on the TEAMS, especially in mathematics.	All elementary principals wrote and submitted campus goals related to the TEAMS to their appropriate supervising principal by Nov. 1986.
3. Support will be provided to campuses to aid them in their efforts to meet their achievement goals	Various kinds of materials were distributed to all elementary campuses. Included were sets of practice tests for TEAMS, many samples of practice test items, resource books with additional sample test items in reading, mathematics and writing and TEA TEAMS instructional strategies guides.
4. The principals' goal-setting process and other activities related to improving student achievement in mathematics will be monitored.	The supervising principals monitored principals goals and activities related to them.
5. Excellence in instructional leadership will be rewarded.	Excellence in Instructional Leadership in 1986-87 will be recognized in August, 1987.
6. Principals will be provided with 1986-87 test results and successful strategies which will be useful for 1987-88 planning.	Principals received 1986-87 test results for their individual campus. At the June 11 Principals' Retreat TEAMS test results were discussed. Successful strategies will be incorporated into August planning for 1987-88.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
ELEMENTARY			
5/xx/86	1.1	Call a meeting of appropriate personnel to begin a discussion of TEAMS performance and strategies to improve students' mastery of the TEAMS objectives, especially mathematics.	A meeting took place on May 30, 1986. Discussion focused on improvement of TEAMS scores. In attendance: . Glynn Ligon . David Doss . Timy Baranoff . Ruben Olivarez . Ruth MacAllister . Supervising principals
6/xx/86	1.2	Call a meeting of elementary principals and direct ORE staff to share information on District performance and ranking on the TEAMS among urban districts. Provide motivation to improve TEAMS performance and introduce Dr. Popham's strategies for improvement of student mastery of the TEAMS objectives.	Principals met on June 5, 1986. Also in attendance: . Timy Baranoff . Ruben Olivarez . Supervising principals . Glynn Ligon . David Doss . Evangelina Mangino Important information was shared by ORE. Greg Swimelar shared strategies that had been successful at Blanton and his campus scores. Verginia Stevens and Dr. David Doss shared information presented by Dr. Popham.
10/xx/86	1.3	Call a meeting of elementary principals to share additional information about student performance on the TEAMS.	Principals met on October 22, 1986 Also in attendance: . Timy Baranoff . Ruben Olivarez . Supervising principals . Glynn Ligon . Evangelina Mangino Dr. Doss provided TEAMS data analyzed by ethnic group.
8/xx/86	1.4	Revise goal-setting manual to provide it as a resource for 1986-87, incorporating Popham strategies as appropriate.	Dr. Timy Baranoff, Dr. David Doss and a committee made up of central office and campus staff completed the revision of the manual in time

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
			for Elementary Principals' Retreat on August 8, 1986.
8/xx/86	1.5	Plan a workshop for elementary principals, assistant principals, helping teachers, coordinators and other administrators to stress the importance of TEAMS data and Popham strategies and to give staff an opportunity to practice writing TEAMS practice test items.	At the Administrators' Workshop on August 5 and 7, 1986 Dr. David Doss and Dr. Evangelina Mangino presented information on TEAMS data and Popham strategies to administrators and helping teachers.
8/xx/86	1.6	Plan an elementary principals' retreat at which the revised goal-setting manual would be reviewed and individual campus TEAMs data shared.	An Elementary Principals' Retreat took place on August 8, 1986. Dr. Timy Baranoff and Eleanor Dugger, presented the revised guide and Dr. David Doss presented individual campus data on TEAMS.
8/xx/86	2.1	Direct each principal to have staff view the superintendent's convocation tape.	All campuses received information about the superintendent's convocation message.
8/xx/86	2.2	Direct each principal to share with faculties, copies of TEAMS objectives, TEAMS test data and to direct staff to study Popham's strategies.	These activities took place on all campuses during September and October. Monitoring was provided by the supervising principals.
9/xx/86 10/xx/86 11/xx/86	2.3	Direct principals to write school goals and activities (an action plan) to address basic skills instruction, to involve grade level chairs and groups and to make these available to the supervising principals and the assistant superintendent for elementary education.	Supervising principals and the assistant superintendent monitored these activities and reviewed copies of school goals and activities during September, October and November. Feedback on action plans is being provided by supervising principals.
9/xx/86 10/xx/86 11/xx/86	2.4	Ask individual campus to participate in writing TEAMS practice test items beginning with the area of mathematics	Sixteen schools have participated in these activities and have submitted items. The practice test items are being reviewed by coor-

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
		and to send them to the curriculum coordinators for review.	dinators and should be available to campuses in December. Practice test items reviewed by coordinators were distributed to campuses in December for use by teachers in grades 1, 3 & 5.
9/xx/86 10/xx/86	2.5	Direct principals to implement their plan of actions.	Supervising principals are monitoring principals and will continue to do so.
11/xx/86	2.6	Direct principals to consider any changes that need to be made in their goals based on ethnic data presented on October 22.	Supervising principals are monitoring. A memorandum was sent on Nov. 25 by Ruth MacAllister to principals requesting an addendum to their action plans by Dec. 17.
2/xx/87 or 5/xx/87	2.7	Direct principals to insist that all of the TEAMS objectives be taught before testing time.	This information was contained in the goal setting process manual and is one of the Popham strategies. Principals used the guide to plan their inservices on TEAMS. Oral reminders have been given at principals' meetings. Teacher and parent bulletins reflect that principals are carrying out this mandate.
	2.8	Send memorandum to elementary principals reminding them of TEAMS focus.	A memorandum was sent by Dr. Timy Baranoff to elementary principals on November 10, 1986 reminding them that compensatory teachers are to stress mastery of the TEAMS objectives, that tutorials are to be focused on TEAMS and that the reteach cycle is an important part of the regular instructional teaching cycle.
	3.1	Provide monetary support to Northeast Schools to purchase additional materials intended	Additional funds were given to Winn, Blanton, Read, Andrews, Pecan Springs and Harris to pur-

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
		to improve student performance on the TEAMS tests, particularly in mathematics.	chase additional sets of TEAMS practice tests, effective schools materials and other supplementary materials related to the TEAMS. ($7,700.00)
10/xx/86	3.2	Invite several schools to pilot Random House "Scoring High" materials (test taking skills). Plan for representative to present these materials at an optional principals' meeting.	Four schools, including Zavala, Norman, Andrews and Harris were provided with Random House materials in the spring of 1986 for use in 1986-87. Random House offered an optional session on October 12, 1986.
9/xx/86	3.3	Train teachers and coordinators to write appropriate TEAMS practice test items, beginning with the area of mathematics. Direct this group to write and send in items.	Teachers and coordinators were trained by Dr. Timy Baranoff to write correct TEAMS practice test items on August 14, 1986. Items received from teachers in September were reviewed by curriculum coordinators.
8/xx/86	3.4	Send all elementary teachers a letter complimenting them for their efforts on TEAMS and providing them with new information on how to improve students' mastery of the TEAMS objectives. (Dr. Popham's strategies)	A letter was distributed to all teachers in August 1986.
10/xx/86 and 11/xx/86	3.5	Set aside coordinator workdays to review TEAMS practice test items sent in by campuses.	TEAMS practice items are being reviewed by a small group of curriculum coordinators as they arrive. Scheduled workdays occurred on September 4 and 11, 1986. Coordinators continued reviewing practice test items all fall.
10/xx/86	3.6	Send principals an October priorities memorandum which includes the item "Goal-setting" (action plan for achievement).	A memorandum was sent by the assistant superintendent on October 29, 1986.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
10/xx/86 and 11/xx/86	3.7	Provide campuses with Region XIII TEAMS practice tests for grades 1, 3 and 5.	Individual campus orders were sent to Region XIII as they came in during October. Region XIII delivered orders as processed. (16,000.00)
9/xx/86 and 10/xx/86	3.8	Provide campuses with commercial materials designed to assist with improving TEAMS scores.	A number of items have been sent to campuses. Included were: . TEAMS Skill Practice Booklets for Grades 1, 3, and 5 purchased from Aus-Tex Supplies $1,300.00 (Practice Test Items) . TEA TEAMS Instructional Strategies Guides. Booklets were reproduced for all regular teachers (grades 1, 3 and 5), special education and compensatory teachers. The booklets describe format and measurement specifications and provide sample items. . Region XIII Instructional Activities for grades 1, 3 and 5 were provided. $2,000.
12/xx/86	3.9	Direct ORE to prepare tests for each objective for which sufficient items have been developed to be used at the campus level in pre and post testing (particularly in mathematics).	ORE typed up practice test items which could be used in various ways by teachers. These were all distributed by 1/9/87.
1/xx/87	3.10	Distribute TEAMS objectives in English and Spanish to parents of first, third and fifth grade children.	Copies of the TEAMS objectives for parents of third and fifth graders were distributed to all campuses in December for distribution in January.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date	Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
11/26/86	3.11 Present report by Northeast principals to elementary school principals (efforts and strategies to improve TEAMS scores).	The report was shared at the November 26 elementary principals meeting.
12/xx/86 1/xx/87	3.12 Provide principals with quick turn around on grading TEAMS practice tests.	ORE made this offer in a memorandum sent out on November 13, 1986.
6/xx/86 8/xx/86 6/xx/87 8/xx/87 1/20/87 2/20/87 8/30/87	3.13 Provide mathematics materials, inservice and information to classroom teachers.	Beginning in January 1986, two day problem solving workshops have been offered to AISD teachers and principals. These workshops were repeated in June and August 1986 and will be offered again in June and August, 1987. Sets of mathematics manipulatives were provided to every grade level in January 1986 (regular and special education teachers). One teacher per school was trained in the use of these materials. Two day training sessions for teachers and administrators took place in January 1986 and 1987. Sixty teachers and administrators received training in "Math Solutions" on January 20 & 21, 1987 Summer school math materials were distributed in late January to nine elementary schools that were in the lowest performing category on the TEAMS. Accompanying staff development was held on each campus. One half day of staff development was devoted to demonstrating to 200 teachers the use of math manipulatives provided to K-6 classroom teachers.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date	Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
		Planning has also been completed with Region XIII for grade level problem solving 2 day workshops for teachers K-6. Follow-up one day sessions will offer advanced training to these teachers. Planning with representatives of UT math department has taken place. A 3 week intensive training for 30 teachers will take place July 13-31, 1987. The institute will cover math content and teacher training (if grant approved). Update - UT received the grant. Coordinators worked with UT to disseminate information about the summer training session to all campuses. Teachers of minority students received preference.
11/xx/86	3.14 Offer TEAMS assistance to principals whose students are performing at a low level on the TEAMS. (Schools identified by TEA - STITT principals)	A meeting was held on November 11 at Commerce Park. In attendance were identified principals, helping teachers, coordinators who serve these schools, Ruth MacAllister, Estelle Brooks, Evangelina Mangino and Timy Baranoff. Categories of assistance were: staff development, coordinator time and instructional materials. Principals were to respond by December 1. (Date extended until December 12) Principals requests began arriving the week of November 24. On November 26, these principals were sent additional copies of TEAMS Instructional Strategies Guides for grades 2 and 4.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
			Requests from all STITT principals reviewed and sent on to Lee Laws' office by January 5, 1987. Each school is to receive $2,000.00.
11/26/86	3.15	Plan a principal meeting to provide additional help for principals and to keep the focus on TEAMS	A special principal meeting was held on November 26. The meeting included a panel discussion and group discussions all related to TEAMS (teacher knowledge and attitudes, monitoring efforts, successful activities, etc.). A videotape on Effective Schools was also shown.
10/xx/86	4.1	Direct Joe Dan Mills to meet with Dr. Mangino and Dr. Doss to set dates by which campus achievement results will be available to the supervising principals for use in evaluations.	A meeting took place during October 1986.
11/xx/86 12/xx/86	4.2	Review and evaluate the action plans (goals and activities) of each campus.	Supervising principals carried out these activities in October and November 1986. The assistant superintendent received a copy of the action plans.
10/xx/86 11/xx/86 12/xx/86	4.3	Observe and evaluate and provide feedback to principals on activities related to improving student learning as evidenced by TEAMS. (Emphasis: check principal's ability to monitor instruction)	
Ongoing	4.4	Direct coordinators to monitor the presentation and teaching of TEAMS in regular classrooms and compensatory instruction.	Coordinators are working very closely with principals whose TEAMS scores were below the 25% ile and fulfilling requests for additional time and practical help for teachers.

Priority II.A(continued)Elementary

ACTIVITIES:

Target Date		Activities	Status as of 6/11/87
11/xx/86 12/xx/86 1/xx/87	5.1	Present certificates and commendations to principals who exhibit unusually strong planning on monitoring procedures related to student achievement.	Concept was dropped by Asst. Supt. and supervising principals.
5/xx/87 6/xx/87	5.2	Provide ample opportunity for recognition of principals whose schools show unusually good gains on the TEAMS scores.	Principals whose students showed large increases in mastery of the TEAMS objectives were recognized at an administrators meeting on May 13, 1987.
6/xx/87 and 8/xx/87	6.1	Present at an elementary principals' meeting, 1986-87 test data; match successful campuses with strategies and plan to share information at Administrators workshop and principal August retreat.	The results of the TEAMS tests/ student mastery of the TEAMS objectives were discussed at the June 11 principal retreat. ORE shared District and individual campus test results.
6/xx/87 8/xx/87	6.2	Plan goal-setting process for 1987-88 using selected principals (those showing unusually good improvement on the TEAMS).	The results of the TEAMS tests and individual performances were discussed in June by the Assistant Superintendent, Director of Curriculum and Supervising Principals. Discussions will continue.
7/xx/87 and 8/xx/87	6.3	Direct successful principals to plan and present the goal-setting process for 1987-88.	
8/xx/87	6.4	Present at the Administrators' Workshop a report of scores of schools with exceptional gains and strategies of these schools.	
6/xx/87 7/xx/87 8/xx/87	6.5	Analyze test scores on TEAMS for problem areas to identify schools needing assistance/ monitoring during goal setting process and the year. (Asst./ Supt., Director, and Supervising Principals)	